

required to consider four factors:

- (1) the degree of plaintiff's responsibility in failing to respond;
- (2) the amount of prejudice to the defendant;
- (3) the history of the plaintiff in proceeding in a dilatory manner; and,
- (4) the existence of less drastic sanctions other than dismissal.

Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69 (4th Cir. 1978).

In the present case, the plaintiff is proceeding pro se so he is entirely responsible for his actions. It is solely through plaintiff's neglect, and not that of an attorney, that no responses have been filed. Plaintiff has not responded to defendants' motion to dismiss for lack of prosecution, or the court's Orders requiring him to respond. Further, the *Roseboro* Order was returned to the Clerk of Court's office via United States Postal Service as undeliverable. (Document #30). Additionally, the court's Scheduling Order of February 28, 2008, was returned to the Clerk of Court's office via United States Postal Service on March 4, 2008, marked "Return to Sender." (Document # 26). Plaintiff has not provided the court with an updated address as required by the Order of January 25, 2008. (Document #6). The undersigned concludes the plaintiff has abandoned his lawsuit. No other reasonable sanctions are available. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b).

II. CONCLUSION

As set out above, a review of the record indicates that the plaintiff's complaint should be dismissed for failure to prosecute. It is, therefore,

RECOMMENDED that plaintiff's complaint be dismissed for failure to prosecute pursuant

to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b).

Respectfully submitted,

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

April 16, 2008
Florence, South Carolina

The parties' attention is directed to the important information on the attached notice.